TWG

Thompson Wigdor & Gilly LLP ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

85 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10003 Tel 212.257.6800 Fax 212.257.6845 www.twglaw.com

Douglas H. Wigdor

October 23, 2008

BY FACSIMILE

Honorable Loretta A. Preska United States District Judge Southern District of New York United States Courthouse 500 Pearl Street, Room 1320 New York, NY 10007

Re: Grauer v. UBS Financial Services Inc., et al., 07-CV-5450

Dear Judge Preska:

As you know, we represent UBS Financial Services Inc. ("UBSFS") in the above-referenced matter and write to respectfully request that the Court re-consider its Order dated October 22, 2008, in which UBSFS was ordered to produce a 30(b)(6) witness to testify about the counterclaim damages chart. There is simply no UBSFS employee who can go through the chart line-by-line and explain it to Ms. Goodman because it is defense counsel's work product (that was produced pursuant to Court order). Indeed, the counterclaim damages chart is a demonstrative exhibit. Thomas Reichert will lay the foundation for the documents we used to obtain the information in the chart and then we, as counsel will explain the chart, which simply calculates the numbers contained within the documents. This would be similar to a criminal case wherein the Government introduces various exhibits to demonstrate the size of the loss and the prosecutor, in summation, puts together the various documents and calculates the total loss. Surely, once the documents are introduced, the lawyers are free to make arguments concerning their significance.

USDC SDNY

DOCUMENT

Towards that end, we have already produced Mr. Reichert as a witness to testify regarding the information in the documents we disclosed to Ms. Goodman prior to that deposition. Ms. Goodman could have asked Mr. Reichert about any document that we turned over to her as part of our damages calculation. There is no one else at UBSFS, who can provide more information about the counterclaim damages chart. While I do not believe we are obligated to do so under

Ø 003

21003/003

Thompson Wigdor & Gilly LLP ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

Honorable Loretta A. Preska October 23, 2008 Page 2

the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, I have told Ms. Goodman that we are personally willing to sit down with her and explain line-by-line how we calculated our damages. We are still willing to do that, but cannot produce a UBSFS witness to do so when none exists.

Thank you for your attention to and consideration of our request.

Respectfully Submitted,

Douglas H. Wigdor

cc:

Janice Goodman, Esq. (by facsimile & e-mail) Thomas M. Knepper, Esq. (by facsimile)

UBS' motion for reconsideration does not comply with the requirements of local Cirl Rule 6.3 in that it merely restates the Rule 6.3 in that it merely restates the prior argument. Accordingly the Corect pathens to its prior order to the effect adheus to its prior order to the effect that a urtness be produced pursuant that a urtness be produced pursuant to Rule 30(6)(6) to leplain UBS' method of calculating damages.

October 24, 2008

& ordered Loretta a Rusky USDJ